Orientals in the U.S.
35:19

COMPARATIVE TABLES

Showing the number of Japanese that would be in each State and fifty cities of 50,000 population and upwards, if each State and City had a Japanese population in proportion to whites, as exists in California and San Francisco.

PUBLISHED BY

THE JAPANESE AND KOREAN EXCLUSION LEAGUE

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

MARCH, 1907

INTRODUCTORY.

These tables are submitted by the Japanese and Korean Exclusion League to illustrate the danger to our social, industrial and political life accompanying the continued influx of Orientals to the mainland of the United States, or, by the admission to the rights of American citizenship of those already here.

The data used for these tabulations are from the Report of the Twelfth Census and figures on file with the Exclusion League. The purpose of this publication is to show the number of Japanese that would be in each State and each large city if the conditions existing in California and other parts of the Pacific Coast were duplicated throughout the United States.

For the purpose of conciseness no attempt has been made to use the percentages or fractional parts usually contained in tabulations of this nature, but the lower figures have been used in every instance, even when benefiting the Japanese side of the question.

An effort has been made to explain each table in detail so that the purpose for which it has been compiled may be perceived, readily and understandingly.

TABLE 1.

Showing the number of Japanese that would be in each State if each had a Japanese population proportionate to that of California. Compiled for the year 1907 from the Twelfth Census Report, and the known number of Japanese in California, January 1, 1907:

STATE.	1900. Chinese in the United States	1900. Japanese in the United States	1900. Population, exclusive of Japanese		1900. Japanese that would have been in each State if proportion had been same as in California	1907. Japanese that would now be in each State if proportionate increase were the same as in California
Alabama	58	3	1,828,694		12,611	75,666
Alaska	3,116	265	63,327		436	2,616
Arizona	1,419	281	122,650		851	5,106
Arkansas	62	.....	1,311,564		9,045	54,270
California	**45,755**	**10,151**	**1,474,902**		**10,151**	**60,906**
Colorado	599	48	539,654		3,654	21,924
Connecticut	599	18	908,402		6,900	41,520
Delaware	51	1	184,734		1,274	7,644
District of Columbia	455	7	278,711		1,922	11,532
Florida	120	1	528,541		3,645	21,870
Georgia	204	1	2,216,230		15,285	91,710
Hawaii	25,767	61,111	92,890		61,111	61,111
Idaho	1,467	1,291	160,481	(125)	1,294	7,744
Illinois	1,503	80	4,821,470		33,251	199,506
Indiana	207	5	2,516,457		17,355	104,130
Indian Territory	27	.....	392,060		2,704	16,224
Iowa	104	7	2,231,846		15,392	92,352
Kansas	39	4	1,470,491		10,141	60,846
Kentucky	57	....	2,147,174		14,808	88,848
Louisiana	599	17	1,381,608		9,528	57,168
Maine	119	4	694,462		4,100	24,600
Maryland	544	9	1,888,035		8,193	49,158
Massachusetts	2,768	53	2,805,293		19,339	116,034
Michigan	240	9	2,420,973		16,696	100,176
Minnesota	166	57	1,751,343		12,078	72,468
Mississippi	237	.....	1,551,270		10,690	64,140
Missouri	449	9	3,106,656		21,451	128,176
Montana	1,739	2,441	240,888	(98)	2,455	14,720
Nebraska	180	3	1,066,297		7,354	44,124
Nevada	1,352	228	42,107		290	1,740
New Hampshire	112	1	411,587		2,838	17,028
New Jersey	1,393	52	1,883,617		12,990	77,940
New Mexico	341	8	195,302		1,347	8,082
New York	7,170	354	7,268,540		50,128	300,768
North Carolina	57	.....	1,893,810		13,061	78,366
North Dakota	32	148	318,998		2,200	13,200
Ohio	371	27	4,157,578		28,672	172,032
Oklahoma	31	.....	398,331		2,747	16,482
Oregon	10,397	2,501	411,035		2,835	17,010
Pennsylvania	1,927	40	6,302,075		43,462	260,772
Rhode Island	366	13	428,543		2,955	17,730
South Carolina	67	.....	1,340,316		9,243	55,458
South Dakota	165	1	401,569		2,769	16,614
Tennessee	75	4	2,020,612		13,935	83,610
Texas	836	13	3,048,697		21,025	126,150
Utah	572	417	276,332		1,905	11,430
Vermont	39	.....	343,641		2,370	14,220
Virginia	243	243	1,854,174		12,787	76,722
Washington	3,259	5,617	512,486	(691)	5,617	33,702
West Virginia	56	56	958,800		6,613	39,678
Wisconsin	212	212	2,069,037		14,269	85,614
Wyoming	461	461	92,138		639	3,810
U. S. Army and Navy	304	284				
Total	119,050	86,000	76,317,387		588,411	3,224,447

Table 1 shows conclusively that if the States east of the Rocky Mountains had a Japanese population proportionate with that of California, the question of exclusion would appear to them more worthy of consideration than at present. The table shows, also, the number of Chinese and Japanese in each State as per census of 1900, the population of each State (not including Japanese), the number of Japanese that would have been in each State in 1900 if in the same proportion to the other population as in California, and also the number that would be in each State at the present time, if computed upon the proportionate increase in this State.

In 1900 the proportion of Japanese to all others in California was 1 to 145, and column 4 indicates the number that would have been in each State at the taking of the census in 1900, providing the proportion in California were maintained throughout the country.

Between 1900 and January 1, 1907, the Japanese in California increased from 10,151 to about 65,000, or over 500 per cent. Column 5 shows how many Japanese would be in each State, in accordance with this marvelous and dangerous increase.

It will be seen that Hawaii is not credited with an increase, that Territory being merely a port of call for the immigrants, their real destination being the mainland. In 1900 three States had a greater proportion of Japanese than California—Idaho, with 1 to 125, Montana, 1 to 98, and Washington, 1 to 91; but for comparison the tabulations are computed upon the number of Japanese in California, 1 to 145 of all others.

TABLE 2.

Showing the number of Japanese that would be in cities of 100,000 population and cities of 50,000 and over if each had a Japanese population in proportion to those in San Francisco, 1 Japanese to 40 others.

1900	1900.	1907.	1907.
CITIES OF 100,000 AND OVER.	Number of Japanese per census of 1900.....	Estimated population of cities, based upon increase, 1890-1900.....	Number of Japanese that would be in each city if the proportion to other population were the same as in San Francisco.....
New York	286	3,591,703	89,792
Chicago	68	1,996,907	49,922
Philadelphia	12	1,417,063	35,426
St. Louis	4	636,972	15,924
Boston	29	617,709	15,427
Baltimore	4	546,216	13,655
Cleveland	11	441,975	11,049
Buffalo	1	400,748	10,018
San Francisco	**1,781**	**400,000**	**10,000**
Cincinnati	....	340,399	8,500
Pittsburgh	1	363,115	9,077
New Orleans	5	309,636	7,740
Detroit	2	325,618	8,140
Milwaukee	....	325,738	8,143
Washington	7	302,881	7,572
Newark	3	278,190	6,954
Jersey City	1	228,148	5,703
Louisville	....	226,532	5,663
Minneapolis	....	221,708	5,542
Providence	2	197,322	4,933
Indianapolis	1	201,028	5,025
Kansas City, Mo	2	179,270	4,481
St. Paul	5	178,019	4,450
Rochester	2	176,964	4,424
Toledo	....	157,016	3,925
Columbus	5	144,265	3,606
New Haven	11	121,391	3,034
Fall River	....	120,095	3,002
Denver	19	147,432	3,685
Memphis	....	121,232	3,030
Scranton	2	115,431	2,885
St. Joseph	....	128,306	3,207
Paterson	....	118,583	2,964
Worcester	....	135,304	3,382
Los Angeles	150	128,521	3,213
Total	2,414	15,339,432	383,493

1900.	1907.	1907.	1900.
CITIES OF 50,000 AND OVER.	Estimated population of cities, based upon increase, 1890-1900.....	Number of Japanese that would be in each city if the proportion to other population were the same as in San Francisco.....	Number of Japanese per census of 1900.....
Seattle	99,588	2,489	2,990
Oakland	150,000	3,750	194
Albany	94,151	2,553	....
Bridgeport	82,061	2,051	4
Camden	84,246	2,106	....
Charleston, S. C.	56,020	1,400	....
Dayton	85,333	1,205	....
Des Moines	68,162	1,704	3
Duluth	62,896	1,572	....
Elizabeth	59,313	1,482	....
Erie	58,782	1,469	6
Evansville	63,132	1,578	....
Grand Rapids	101,208	2,530	....
Harrisburg	55,558	1,388	....
Hartford	93,160	2,329	....
Hoboken	67,222	1,680	2
Lawrence	71,511	1,787	....
Lowell	103,105	2,577	1
Lynn	74,906	1,872	....
Portland, Or.	112,446	2,811	1,189
Total	1,642,800	40,333	4,389

In estimating the population of the above cities, the increase between the census returns of 1890 and 1900 were found and 50 per cent of that increase added to the number given in the report of 1900. For San Francisco and Oakland, however, an arbitrary estimate has been made, and possibly too small a one. The estimates of real estate men place the population of San Francisco between 400,000 and 450,000. It has been deemed wise to adopt the more conservative number.

The proportion of Japanese to all others in San Francisco has been placed at 1 to 40 others. The estimate of 10,000 as the Japanese population of this city is derived from a statement of Consul-General Uyeno, and that number is used as a basis for the computations, though it is certain there are a great many more.

Seattle, according to the table, has less Japanese than in 1900, but a conservative estimate places the number between 7,000 and 8,000. Oakland, with an estimated population of 150,000, is given 3,750 Japanese, some 1,500 too little, while the increase of the Japanese in Portland is much more than is shown in the tabulation. Honolulu has been omitted for obvious reasons, and though as indicated in Table 1, the Japanese population of Hawaii has not increased to any great extent, the population of Honolulu has become more Japanized, owing to the laborers deserting the plantations for city life. Honolulu in 1900 had 6,179 Japanese; today more than 10,000.

Analysis of this table shows us that the Japanese are prone to concentrate and form large colonies, silently occupying and tenaciously holding every vantage ground. A study of the increase of the Japanese (by counties, 1880, 1890, 1900, 1905), as shown on pages 7-8 of a pamphlet on Japanese immigration, etc., published by the Exclusion League, January 1, 1907, will indicate how rapidly these people increase when once they have established a small colony. This table illustrates what may happen or be expected when the trend of Japanese immigration is from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

TABLE 3.

Showing the possible result of Japanese and Chinese being admitted to citizenship, together with the number of Japanese voters that would be in each State were their numbers equal to those in California.

STATE.	1900. Males of voting age other than Japanese.....	1900. Male Japanese of voting age.....	1907. The number of Japanese voters there would be in each State if they were naturalized, and if each State had a number proportionate with that of California	1900. Male Chinese of voting age.....
Alabama	413,859	3	41,385	52
Alaska	37,708	248	3,770	3,078
Arizona	43,880	201	4,388	1,277
Arkansas	313,836	.....	31,383	50
California	**537,295**	**6,792**	**53,729**	**38,000**
Colorado	185,678	30	18,567	555
Connecticut	280,318	22	28,031	553
Delaware	54,017	1	5,401	48
District of Columbia	83,814	9	8,381	404
Florida	139,600	1	13,960	116
Georgia	500,751	1	50,075	174
Hawaii	38,276	41,331	41,331	18,457
Idaho	53,042	890	5,304	1,370
Illinois	140,386	70	14,038	1,409
Indiana	720,206	4	72,020	191
Indian Territory	97,361	....	9,736	27
Iowa	635,288	10	63,528	88
Kansas	413,784	2	41,378	37
Kentucky	543,995	1	54,399	44
Louisiana	325,931	12	32,593	535
Maine	217,657	6	21,765	93
Maryland	321,997	6	32,199	480
Massachusetts	843,410	55	84,341	2,581
Michigan	719,471	7	71,947	217
Minnesota	506,753	41	50,675	143
Mississippi	349,177	....	34,917	199
Missouri	856,677	7	85,677	435
Montana	100,121	1,810	10,012	1,628
Nebraska	301,085	6	30,108	178
Nevada	17,532	178	1,753	1,209
New Hampshire	130,986	1	13,098	98
New Jersey	555,553	45	55,555	1,307
New York	2,184,965	317	218,496	6,612
New Mexico	55,061	6	5,506	306
North Carolina	417,577	1	41,757	43
North Dakota	95,093	124	9,509	30
Ohio	1,212,206	17	121,220	326
Oklahoma	109,191	...	10,919	32
Oregon	142,540	1,900	14,254	9,139
Pennsylvania	1,817,209	30	181,720	1,786
Rhode Island	127,130	14	12,713	336
South Carolina	283,325	....	28,332	61
South Dakota	112,681	....	11,268	140
Tennessee	487,376	4	48,737	64
Texas	737,760	8	73,776	762
Utah	66,875	297	6,687	526
Vermont	108,356	....	10,835	36
Virginia	447,805	10	44,780	228
Washington	191,210	4,362	19,121	3,348
Wisconsin	570,711	4	57,071	198
Wyoming	37,606	292	3,760	420
West Virginia	247,970	....	24,797	45
Total	21,170,619	59,176	2,030,680	99,741

Table 3 indicates the population of Japanese of voting age to that of the whites.

Column 3 indicates the number of Japanese of voting age that would be in each State in 1907 if the proportion in California—1 Japanese to 10 of all others—were maintained throughout the whole country. In California the proportion of Japanese women and children to the males is very small and the figures, 53,729, indicating the number of Japanese males of voting age is well within the number that would be found by actual count. In 1900 there were also 38,000 Chinese of voting age in California, and today, notwithstanding the appreciable decrease in that element of our population, there are at least 30,000 Chinese of voting age in the State, which added to the Japanese of voting age, would make, if admitted to citizenship, fully one-sixth of the total voting population of California.

The people of California and of the United States stand aghast at the dangerous possibilities confronting them through the advocacy by certain Americans (?) of Mongolian citizenship.

Upon searching the census and other government reports for figures for this compilation, it was discovered that in many instances the Japanese are not separately classified, but are placed with the Chinese under the heading of Mongolians. This is particularly noticeable in the census and immigration reports and those of the ethnological division of the Smithsonian Institute. For this reason the figures above given are not so full as contemplated by the compilers.

Column 4 shows the number of Chinese of voting age in 1900. Between 1890-1900 there was a net decrease in the Chinese of 16.4 per cent. Between 1900-1907 the records of the various steamship companies show a steady decrease of Chinese, but the results of an investigation, on the Mexican boundary, by Special Agent Braun show that there is a steady flow of Chinese into the United States by that route. The conclusions are that, though the Chinese are decreasing in California, their numbers are increasing in the Atlantic States and in the States adjoining Canada.

1907

Alameda.

1889